

REMARKS

Applicant and the undersigned attorney thank Examiner Bashore for the Examiner's review of this patent application. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments to the application and in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this amendment, Claims 1 and 3-20 were pending in the application. Claims 1 and 3-20 have been rejected.

Van De Vanter and Gipson, Do Not, Either Singularly or in Combination, Describe, Teach or Suggest the Invention of Claims 1, and 3-20

In paragraph 6 of the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 3-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,212 to *Van De Vanter* ("*Van De Vanter*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,778,402 to *Gipson* ("*Gipson*"). Applicant provides the following remarks to traverse this rejection.

Claim 1

In response to Applicant's previous response filed April 24, 2000, the Examiner alleged that *Van De Vanter* describes the movement and placement of a cursor whereby the physical contextual display of the cursor is dependant upon the position of the cursor relevant to the position of editable character elements. The sections of *Van De Vanter* cited by the Examiner describe only that a cursor can be moved or placed over existing tokens. Applicant submits that *Van De Vanter* limits the placement of a cursor to certain insertion points based upon existing tokens and separators. *See*, Column 22, Table 3. In contrast, the claimed invention "eliminates insertion point placement limitations, which had been previously limited vertically by the need for paragraph marks and which had been limited horizontally by the need for other characters or spaces. Application, page 7, third paragraph.

The foregoing amendment to Claim 1 clarifies that a cursor location can be positioned over existing text or over no existing text. Claim 1 recites determining whether the cursor is positioned over existing text. If the cursor is positioned over existing text, then context information associated with the existing text is collected. If the cursor is positioned so that it is over no existing text, then context information associated with existing text that is proximate to the cursor position is collected. By distinguishing between a cursor location that is positioned over existing text and a cursor location that is positioned over no existing text, the claimed invention “allows a user to place an insertion point at various points within an electronic document without having to manually add spaces, tabs or carriage returns to the document.” Application, page 6, last paragraph.

The Examiner also alleged that *Van De Vanter* describes changing the presentation of the cursor. In support of this allegation, the Examiner cited Column 36, lines 59-67 and Column 37, lines 9-15 of *Van De Vanter*. The cited sections of *Van De Vanter* describe that the top and bottom points of the cursor are modified to indicate the type of insertion point, i.e. an insertion point within a token, an insertion point between tokens on a line, at the right of a separator, etc. The cited sections of *Van De Vanter* only describe modifying the cursor to reflect the type of insertion point. The cited sections of *Van De Vanter* do not describe that the presentation of the cursor is changed to indicate the type of formatting that will be applied to text and objects located in close proximity to the cursor location, as recited by Claim 1. Moreover, the cited section of *Gipson* describes an autocorrect feature that replaces one character string with another character string. The cited section of *Gipson* does not describe changing the presentation of a cursor and thus, does not describe changing the presentation of the cursor to indicate the type of formatting that will be applied.

Applicant submits that there is no motivation to combine *Van De Vanter* and *Gipson*. The Office Action does not include a citation that describes how the modified cursor described by *Van De Vanter* can work with the autocorrect feature described by *Gipson*. Nor does the Office Action include a citation that describes how the method described by *Van De Vanter* could benefit from the

autocorrect feature described by *Gipson*. Moreover, even if the references are combined, the combination does not describe determining whether the cursor is positioned over existing text or changing the presentation of the cursor to indicate the type of formatting that will be applied to text and objects located in close proximity to the cursor location.

Claims 10 and 15

The Examiner rejected Claims 10 and 15 by repeating the arguments made in rejecting Claim 1. The foregoing amendment amends Claims 10 and 15 to clarify that a cursor location can be positioned over existing text or over no existing text. Applicant reiterates the remarks made above in support of Claim 1 to distinguish Claims 10 and 15 from the cited references.

Dependent Claims

Claims 3-9 and 19-20, 11-14, and 16-18 depend from independent Claims 1, 10 and 15 respectively. The remarks made above in support of the independent claims are equally applicable to distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references.

In rejecting Claims 5 and 7, the Examiner cited the autocorrect feature described in *Gipson*. Applicant submits that the autocorrect feature described in *Gipson* only operates on existing characters or text. In contrast, Claim 1, and thus, Claims 5 and 7 recite that a cursor can be positioned over existing text or over no existing text. The foregoing amendment amends Claim 5 to clarify that formatting properties are added and deleted from the electronic document. The cited section of *Gipson* only describes the replacement of character strings. The cited section of *Gipson* does not describe adding or deleting formatting properties.

The Examiner also cited the “delete next character” command described by *Van De Vanter*. Again, the “delete next character” command is limited to deleting existing characters. In addition, the “delete next character” command does not describe adding or deleting formatting properties.

The foregoing amendment to Claim 6 clarifies that a determination is made as to whether the cursor is positioned over existing text. Applicant submits that neither *Van De Vanter* nor *Gipson* describe such a determination.

In rejecting Claim 12, the Examiner cited the alignment markers described by *Van De Vanter*. The alignment markers indicate the alignment of tokens. However, the alignment markers do not describe different types of alignment icons, as defined by Claim 12. Claim 12 defines a left alignment icon, a right alignment icon, a center alignment icon and a text wrap icon.

The preceding arguments are based on the arguments presented in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not described, taught, or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Notification of Change of Address

Please be advised that effective September 1, 2000, Jones & Askew, LLP is now known as Kilpatrick Stockton LLP. Therefore, please address all future correspondence in this matter to:

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
Attn: Brenda O. Holmes, Esq.
2400 Monarch Tower
3424 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30326



Serial No. 09/098,366

RECEIVED

SEP 28 2000

TC 2700 MAIL ROOM

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed July 18, 2000. Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call Brenda Holmes at (404) 949-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
2400 Monarch Tower
3424 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30326
(404) 949-2400
Our File: 13237-1755
MS File: 99137